UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS BEAUMONT DIVISION

Bruce Cohn,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:24-cv-00337

v.

Anna Popescu, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Temporary Restraining Order

Plaintiff Bruce Cohn hereby moves to extend the extant Temporary Restraining Order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(2).

I. Background

At Plaintiff's request, the Court issued a Temporary Restraining Order on May 29, 2025 (the "TRO"). Dkt. 38. The TRO ordered the freezing of blockchain addresses holding assets traceable to Mr. Cohn. Circle Financial Limited recently blacklisted and froze the targeted blockchain addresses in compliance with the TRO. If not extended, the TRO will expire on June 6, 2025.

II. Legal Standard

Under FRCP 65(b)(2), a TRO may be extended by up to 14 days "for good cause." In crypto-related cases like this one, Courts have granted

extensions of asset-freezing TROs to allow plaintiffs to continue working with exchanges on implementation and information gathering in preparation for a motion for preliminary injunction, and to allow additional time to serve notice on interested parties in advance of plaintiffs' forthcoming motions for preliminary injunctions.¹

III. Request for Extension

Plaintiff requests that the Court extend the TRO for 14 days to June 20, 2025. This extension would allow Mr. Cohn to file a motion for alternate service on the accountholder associated with the targeted blockchain addresses and provide notice of his forthcoming Motion for Preliminary Injunction, which will request that the freeze be extended through trial. Plaintiff respectfully submits that these considerations show good cause for extension of the TRO under FRCP 65, and requests that the Court enter an extension in the form of the Proposed Order submitted along with this Motion.

¹ See, e.g., Licht v. Ling, No. 23-cv-01018, Order Granting 14-Day Extension of Temporary Restraining Order, pp. 1—2 (N.D. Tex. May 24, 2023) (granting extension of asset-freeze TRO in crypto-fraud case where the alleged victim was "work[ing] diligently with the exchanges to (1) resolve

issues related to service and (2) obtain discovery regarding the defendants so they can be given notice of the suit and the TRO"); *Astrove v. Doe*, Case No. 22-cv-80614, *Order Modifying and Extending Temporary Restraining Order*,

passim (S.D. Fla. May 3, 2022) (same).

- 2 -

Dated: June 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

THE HODA LAW FIRM, PLLC

Marshal J. Hoda, Esq. Tx. Bar No. 2411009 3120 Southwest Fwy Ste 101 PMB 51811

Houston, TX 77098 o. (832) 848-0036 marshal@thehodalawfirm.com

 $Attorney\ for\ Plaintiff$